Restoration Act. I believe religious accommodation is a cherished right that we must protect. ullet

SITUATION IN IRAQ

• Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the United States is once again facing a decision about whether and how to respond to Iraqi intransigence over the issue of its continued development and concealment of weapons of mass destruction and their associated delivery systems. It is imperative that we not back down, as has already been the case to an alarming degree.

All countries act out of their own economic self-interest. The United States is no exception. We should not, however, acquiesce in such conduct in the case of Iraq. Russia, which seeks compensation for weapons it sold to Baghdad during the Soviet era as well as the hard currency and access to oil that Iraq represents, and France, which similarly pursues contracts for the development of Iraqi oil, have led the way in arguing for a relaxation of the economic sanctions levied against Iraq as a result of its 1990 invasion of Kuwait. Countries like Egypt and Kenya have demonstrated growing sympathy for Irag's economic situation.

The reason why the United States should stand firm and not continue to adopt essentially meaningless positions on the question of sanctions is quite simple: Iraq has to a remarkable degree always held its destiny in its own hands. Little was asked of it other than to come clean on the extent of its efforts to develop weapon systems capable of threatening stability in the world's most volatile region. And, yet, it has consistently, for more than 6 years now, refused to do that, repeatedly challenging the international community and miscalculating the ramifications of its actions.

With regard to its efforts at developing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them, a particularly illuminating episode occurred back in August 1995. It was then that Saddam Hussein s sonsin-law, one of whom had been in charge of overseeing the development of those weapons, defected to Jordan. Anticipating the intelligence coup for the United Nations that was to come, the Iraqis decided to preempt the damage the defectors could cause by revealing a wealth of documents-over half-amillion pages-detailing their biological weapons program. Mr. President, 150 steel trunks and boxes stuffed with documentation that was to have been turned over in the aftermath of the Persian Gulf war, yet would likely have remained hidden indefinitely had the defections not occurred, suddenly and miraculously appeared.

Iraq's refusal to abide by the rules of civilized society and to test the will of the international community has been manifested in other ways also. In October 1994, it moved thousands of troops toward the Kuwaiti border, precipitat-

ing a costly but essential deployment of United States military forces to the region to deter a repeat of the 1990 invasion. Whether Iraq intended to invade Kuwait at that time is highly unlikely; whether a failure to respond on the part of the United States would have emboldened Saddam is beyond dispute.

Two years later, Iraq launched a large-scale concerted ground campaign against Kurdish enclaves in the country s north. Saddam was able to exploit longstanding, violent divisions within the Kurdish population to reestablish a measure of control over territory denied it since the Gulf war. In so doing, it sent a resounding message to the Kurdish population, including that part to which it allied itself during its military incursion, that it was willing and capable of asserting itself within its borders. Particularly disturbing, if totally in character for Saddam, his intelligence service utilized the opportunity to hunt down and execute Kurdish factions hostile to his brutal rule, including hundreds of individuals who had cast their lot with the United States.

The Clinton administration's response to that incursion into territory supposedly under U.N. protection was to launch a small number of embarrassingly ineffectual cruise missile launches in an entirely different region and to expand the no-fly zone in the south. If our intent was to prevent a horizontal escalation of the conflict, we succeeded. The fact that there was not apparent intent on the part of Saddam at that time to conduct military operations in the south was purely academic.

The most recent incident started out considerably more ambiguous, but is no less damaging to the U.N.'s ability to enforce its provisions over the protracted periods of time necessary to get results. Iraq clearly violated the no-fly zone, but only after Iranian attacks against bases of the People s Mojahedin of Iran situation on the Iraqi side of the border. There is a noticeable dearth of sympathetic parties here, but the bottom line is that the no-fly zone was violated, and the administration was correct to respond. Iraq s apparent retaliatory measures, in effect, the refusal to permit United States citizens to participate in the U.N. inspection teams enforcing Security Council resolutions, has been appropriately rejected by members of the Council.

The problem lies in the political environment Council members France and Russia continue to create that encourages Saddam to believe he can act with impunity. It is absolutely imperative that the administration communicate to these countries, as well as to others sympathetic to the plight of the Iraqi people, that the sanctions must remain in place until Iraq finally does what it has resisted doing for 6 years: abide by the conditions of the cease fire. Saddam himself holds his coun-

try's welfare in his hands. All that is asked of him is to place that welfare above his drive to threaten his neighbors with chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. The fact that he has been unwilling to accept that very basic condition illustrates the need to maintain the sanctions in perpetuity if necessary. The international community was willing to isolate South Africa for an indefinite period of time until fundamental changes were implemented. It is entirely reasonable, and essential for the future of our friends and allies in the Middle East as well as for our own economic well-being, that the international community dem-onstrate the same steadfastness in the case of Iraq that it did with South Africa. Morally and practically, it is the only option available to us.

PROMOTION OF JOHN H. OLDFIELD, JR.

• Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the promotion of John H. Oldfield to Brigadier General of the Georgia Air National Guard and applaud his lifelong service to the State of Georgia and to the U.S. military.

Mr. President, Mr. Oldfield, who was born and still resides with his wife and one son in Savannah, GA, has received numerous distinguished military awards and decorations over his career in the Armed Services. These accomplishments, as well as his lifelong dedication to the well being of the State of Georgia, have led to his recent promotion, which was unanimously approved by the U.S. Senate on October 30, 1997.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Brigadier General Oldfield and wish him continued success in his new position.

FAREWELL TO JOHN STURDIVANT

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, yesteday, the Federl employee community said a final goodby to John Sturdivant, the president of the American Federation of Government Employees. John lost his battle with leukemia on October 28.

John Sturdivant lead the American Federation of Government Employees—AFGE—since 1988. In fact, in August he won reelection to another term. To say that he will be missed is an understatement.

Although we did not always agree over the years, there was never any question of John's ultimate goal—protection of the interests of Federal employees.

John Sturdivant was a strong leader and forceful defender of the rights of Federal employees. He recognized the need for public servants. Federal employees provide a necessary and valuable service to our country. They should not be misunderstood or mistreated or maligned. John was himself a good public servant and worked hard to be a strong advocate.